



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,686	03/30/2001	Thomas N. Turba	#RA 5362 (33012/309/101)	9229
7590	10/20/2003		EXAMINER	
Charles A. Johnson Unisys Corporation P O Box 64942 MS 4773 St. Paul, MN 55164			NGUYEN, MERILYN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2171	5
DATE MAILED: 10/20/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/822,686

Applicant(s)

TURBA ET AL.

Examiner

Merilyn P Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***Period for Reply****A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                    4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                            5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                            6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. In response to the communication dated 07/31/2003, claims 1-20 are active in this application.

### *Acknowledges*

2. Receipt is acknowledged of the following items from the Applicant:
  - o The applicant's amendments have been considered and made of record as Paper No. 4.

### *Double Patenting*

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 of copending Application No. 09/821928. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the same limitations.

Regarding claims 1, 6, and 16 of the instant application, claims 1, 6, and 16 of the '928 application recite all the elements of claims 1, 6, and 16 of the instant application. Claims 1, 6, and 16 of the '928 application also includes additional elements that are not recited in the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to omit the additional elements of claims 1, 6, and 16 of the '928 application to arrive at the claims 1, 6, and 16 of the instant application because the one would have realized that the remaining element would perform the same functions as before. "Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform same functions as before." See *In re Karlson* (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184, decide Jan 16, 1963, Appl. No. 6857, U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

The subject matter of claims 2, 3, 5, 7-10, and 18-20 of the '928 application are same as claims 2, 3, 5, 7-10, and 18-20 of instant application.

Regarding claim 11 of the instant application, claim 11 of the '928 application recites all the elements of claims 11 of the instant application since claim 11 of the '928 recites and repeats the steps of claim 11 of instant application. The identifying steps of instant application are obviousness since the presenting steps of '928 application read on this limitation.

The subject matter of claims 13, 14, and 15 of the '928 application are same as claims 13, 14, and 15 of the instant application.

5. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Affidavit Under 37 CFR 1.132/1.131***

6. Indicate on record that the Declaration was improperly filed as an Affidavit under 37 CFR 1.132. Accordingly, the examiner has treated the declaration, including supportive evidence, as a declaration under 37 CFR 1.131. The evidence is persuasive and the rejection of claims 1-20 under 102(e) over Ensor is hereby withdrawn.

However, upon analysis of exhibit B and C, the examiner discovered that the April 16, 2000 Final Report indicated the instant invention (i.e. "CoolICE 2.1") was placed into public use for at least 90 days prior to the Final Report date (April 16, 2000). Hence, the invention was made public more than 1-year prior the filing of this application and therefore serves as an absolute statutory bar.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated over the CoolICE.

Regarding claim 1-20, the Applicant has indicated on record that the CoolICE is in fact the invention claimed herein.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 07/31/2003 about the claim rejection of the last Office Action have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks regarding the provisional double patenting rejection are noted. However, absent a terminal disclaiming or amendment patentability differentiating the inventions, the rejection stands.

9. Applicant's argument that the commercial product of Unisys Corporation called Cool ICE, Revision 2.1 is noted as in Affidavit above.

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Merilyn P Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

MN

MN

October 8, 2003

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100